UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/268,254	03/15/1999	ANTONIUS H.M. HOLTSLAG	PHN-17.049	8145

24737 7590 07/28/2005

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
KOVALICK, VINCENT E	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2677	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/268,254	HOLTSLAG, ANTONIUS H.M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vincent E. Kovalick	2673	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 November 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4 and 5* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 March 1999* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Amendment dated November 18, 2004 in response to USPTO Office Action dated August 31, 2004.

The amendments to independent claims 1, 4-5 have been note and entered in the record.

Applicant's remarks regarding the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1 and 4-5 as well as the teachings in paragraph 0027 of the submitted substitute specification are sufficient to overcome the said 112th, 2nd rejection of said claims 1 and 4-5, said rejection is wherewith withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meehan et al. (USP 5,798,788) taken with Kubota et al. (USP 5,748,165).

Regading claims 1 and 4-5, Meehan et al. **teaches** a method of displaying a video signal with video lines in a video field period on a display panel having a first and a second display field of display lines, the display lines of the first display field being in an interlaced position with respect to the display lines of the second display field, the method comprising the steps:

alternately selecting the first display field only for a first time period lasting longer than the video field, and then the second display field only for a second time period lasting longer than the video field period; it being understood that the this methodology can be applied to several display technologies including plasma display panel technology; further, though Meehan et al. teaches repeating the same field only twice, this feature could be extended to continue to repeat the same field for a specified time frame before alternating to a second field and repeating the process (col. 6, lines 13-20).

Meehan et al. **does not teach** supplying, for each video field period, the video lines of the video signal to the display lines of the selected display field.

Meehan et al. teaches an apparatus for evaluating video displays.

Kubota et al. **teaches** an image display device (col. 3, lines 60-67 and col. 43, lines 1-33); Kubota et al. further **teaches** supplying, for each video field period, the video lines of the video signal to the display lines of the selected display field (col. 4, lines 61-67 and col. 5, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Meehan et al. the feature as taught by Kubota et al. in order to put in place the mean to facilitate the transfer to the video signal to the selected display field.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meehan et al. taken with Kubota et al. as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Green et al. (USP 5,777,631).

Regarding claim 2, Meehan et al. taken with Kubota et al. **does not teach** a method of displaying a video signal characterized in that the number of video lines in a video field period is smaller than or substantially equal to the number of display lines of the first or second display field.

Green et al. **teaches** a method for displaying video data (col. 2, lines 9-54); Green et al. further **teaches** a method of displaying a video signal characterized in that the number of video lines in a video field period is smaller than or substantially equal to the number of display lines of the first or second display field (col. 7, lines 47-52).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Meehan et al. taken with Kubota et al. the feature as taught by Green et al. in order to provide adequate display lines to accommodate the full video field.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 3, the major difference between the teachings of the prior art of record (USP 5,798,788, Meehan et al. and USP 5,748,165, Kubota et al.) and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** a method of displaying a video signal alternately selecting the first display field then the second characterized in that the respective time periods are substantially longer than the video field period.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No.	5,898,414	Awamoto et al.
U. S. Patent No.	5,416,523	Marakami et al.
U. S. Patent No	5,026,151	Waltuck et al.
U. S. Patent No.	4,736,246	Nishikawa

Final Action

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Responses

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent E. Kovalick whose telephone number is 703 306-3020. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30- 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 703 305-4938. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vincent E. Kovalick
May 23, 2005

BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600